DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 314 979 HE 023 138

AUTHOR Earl, Archie W.
TITLE Evolution under Reorganization: A Study of the Relationships between the Director of University Services and Auxiliary Enterprises and the Departments under His Supervision after Reorganization.
PUB DATE 83
NOTE 69p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Change; *Administrator Role; College Administration; Higher Education; Leadership; *Organizational Development; School Organization; *Student Personnel Services
IDENTIFIERS *College of William and Mary VA

ABSTRACT

The study examined change in the role of Director of University Services and Auxiliary Enterprises (USAE) at the College of William and Mary (Virginia) as a result of reorganization of the Business Affairs Office. A review of the literature on organizational development and higher education leadership was conducted. A questionnaire was then designed and the nine members of the administrative staff of the USAE component of the Business Affairs Office were interviewed concerning attitudes toward the role of the Director, the place of USAE at the college, and related areas. Hypotheses to determine whether the change had reached completion were formulated which compared responses of old and new components of the USAE offices and of components directly and indirectly under USAE. Findings indicated that the change in the USAE segment of the Business Affairs Office had reached completion at the time of the study. This state of completion may have been due, in part, to the fact that many of the relationships the Director of USAE had with its components probably existed, informally, before the reorganization took place. 26 references. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED314979

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE

The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: HE

In our judgment, this document is also of interest to the Clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view. EA

EVOLUTION UNDER REORGANIZATION: A STUDY OF THE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE DIRECTOR OF UNIVERSITY SERVICES AND AUXILIARY ENTERPRISES AND THE DEPARTMENTS UNDER HIS SUPERVISION AFTER REORGANIZATION

by

Dr. Archie W. Earl, Sr., Ed.D.
Assistant Professor of Mathematics
Christopher Newport College
Newport News, VA 23606
(804) 594-7000

HE 023 138

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Archie W. Earl, Sr.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Acknowledgements

The researcher wishes to acknowledge all of the help, kindness, and consideration shown him by the entire Business Affairs staff of the College of William and Mary during the conduct of this study. A special word of thanks goes to each of the following individuals: Ms. Helen Adkins, Ms. Shirley Baker, Mr. John Bond, Dr. Jay Chambers, Ms. Norma Chandler, Mr. Dennis Cogle, Mr. Lester Hooker, Dr. Juliette Karow, Mr. Bob Knowlton, Mr. Bruce Locke, Mr. Chuck Lombardo, Ms. Pam Owen, Ms. Becky Raines, Ms. Lila Roberts, Mr. Marty Siegmeister, and Mr. Sam Whitaker. A special word of thanks also goes to my advisor (at the time of this study), Dr. Mary Ann Sagaria, and to Dr. Lawrence W. Broomall (Vice President for Business Affairs) and Mr. David Charlton (Director of University Services and Auxiliary Enterprises), who took me under their wings and showed me what Business Affairs is all about.

I also wish to express my thanks to my wife, Doris, and our two children, Karen and Archie, for helping to proofread the report of the preliminary findings of this study, and to Keisha, for being such a good baby while daddy did his work.

CONTENT

1. INTRODUCTION.....1

Purpose.....1

Definition of Terms.....2

Limitations of the Study.....5

2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE.....6

3. METHODOLOGY.....31

4. RESULTS.....33

5. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....59

BIBLIOGRAPHY.....61

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Purpose

In light of recent trends in higher education, some colleges and universities are hard pressed to come up with new ways to function more efficiently. One step that many colleges and universities have taken is to cutback on personnel--not only on the academic side, but also on the administrative side. (Administrative costs have been among the main reasons for the large increases in the cost of higher education over the past centennial.) Along with retrenching administrative personnel, many colleges and universities have tried to operate more efficiently by reorganizing their administrative staffs. Such a two-prong approach, if effective, could contribute significantly to reducing the cost of a college education. In the midst of shifting responsibilities and personnel, during reorganization, colleges and universities must take care to monitor those shifts to determine whether or not they are accomplishing their intended objectives. It is also important for colleges and universities, in monitoring those shifts, to determine whether or not

they (the shifts) have caused a significant change in the amount and types of relationships between shifted personnel and organizational components.

In December 1982, the Business Affairs Office at the College of William and Mary underwent changes in its internal organizational structure. As a part of this reorganization, the Director of Auxiliary Enterprises, who was responsible for the coordination of Ash Lawn (not included in this analysis), the University Bookstore, the Campus Center, Student Residences, William and Mary Hall (also called R & E Hall in this study), Food Services, Psychological Services, and the Health Center (Table 1), became the Director of University Services and Auxiliary Enterprises (USAE). Along with the new title came new responsibilities (Table 1). The new Directorship position is presently in a state of evolution. At the time of of this study, the relationships between the the Director of USAE and USAE departments (or components) before the change were known. The question that this research seeks to answer is "What are the relationships that the Director has to all of the USAE components at this stage in the evolutionary process?"

Definition of Terms

In this study, a "component" is a department or other subpart of an organization. The "Director of

Table 1
Components of University Services and Auxiliary Enterprises (USAE) at the Subject College

Old Components	New Components
University Bookstore (D)	Buildings and Grounds (D)
Food Services (D)	Purchases and Stores (D)
R & E Hall (D)	
Campus Center (Q)	
Health Center (Q)	
Psychological Services (Q)	
Student Residences (Q)	

D=direct component of USAE
Q=quasi component of USAE

University Services and Auxiliary Enterprises" is the person vested with the responsibility of overseeing and coordinating the operations of all of the components of University Services and Auxiliary Enterprises at the College of William and Mary, as those operations relate to the Office of Business Affairs. The components of University Services and Auxiliary Enterprises, in this study, are divided into two categories, viz., "direct components" and "quasi-components." "Direct components" of USAE are those components for which the Director of USAE has direct program and budgetary control. These are listed in Table 1. "Quasi-components" of USAE include those components for which the Director of USAE exercises indirect program and/or budgetary control through an intermediary. The intermediary may be the president of the College, the Associate Vice President of Academic Affairs, the Associate Dean of Students, or the Dean of Students. The quasi-components are also shown in Table 1.

"Old components" are those components of USAE that were under the directorship of the present director of USAE before reorganization of the Office of Business Affairs took place. "New components" of USAE are those components that came under the direction of the present

Director of USAE as a result of the aforementioned reorganization (Table 1). The term "director" in this study refers to the head of a component or his or her designee. A "positive" response is one in which the respondent indicates a favorable level of satisfaction with the matter presented in the question. A "negative" response to a question is one in which the respondent indicates an unfavorable level of satisfaction with the matter presented in the question.

Limitations of the Study

This study is limited to University Services and Auxiliary Enterprises at the College of William and Mary, and therefore its findings are only generalizable to that entity. The relationships that exist between the director and the components of USAE at other colleges and universities in the United States, will probably be quite different.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Hammons (1982) does a thorough job of explaining the history of organization development (OD), its various parts, and how it compares with other organizational change strategies. He defines OD as "...a process for beneficial change" (p. 6). According to him, OD was an outgrowth of an effort on the part of Lewin, Benne, Bradford, and Lippitt. In 1946, they did research and training for a group of community leaders. Later they founded the National Training Laboratory (NTL, now the NTL Institute for Applied Behavior Science).

Originally, training programs were conducted at regional, national, or statewide conferences or workshops. Workers had to be absent from their jobs in order to attend them. Later it was discovered that the skills and techniques, learned at the conferences and workshops, were not being taken back to the organizations. As a result of this, in 1957, Douglas Mcgregor and John Paul Jones started projects aimed at eliminating this problem. From there, OD spread to include many organizations and institutions, not only

in the United States, but also in other parts of the world.

According to Harmons (1982), "Most changes, especially in educational institutions, could best be described as evolutionary" (p. 11). Other researchers used similar terminology in describing higher education changes (Broomall, 1976; Gould, 1964). Hammons (1982) further indicated that "Organization Development represents change that is planned, is pursued in a systematic fashion, is expected to occur over a long period of time, is systems-oriented, is managed, is based upon participation and involvement by those concerned, takes into account both data and experience, emphasizes goal setting and planning, is implemented with a contingency approach, and focuses on intact work teams" (p. 11).

There are several steps involved in an OD change strategy, viz., (1) a determination is made as to where the organization wants to be, (2) a determination is made as to where it is, and (3) a plan of action is developed to bridge the gap between steps (1) and (2). In addition to the above, a system of monitoring, evaluating and stabilizing should be incorporated. Hammons (1982) puts is this way:

> Once strategies are implemented, the next steps are to monitor the situation in order to ensure that things go according to plan and that revisions are made, if needed, to evaluate in order to determine if strategy achieved desired results, and, if results are as intended, to stabilize the new behavior so that the system will not regress to its former state. (p. 16)

OD interventions are defined as techniques that are intended to produce data. These data can be used to plan which steps will be taken when implementing organizational change. Hammons (1982) lists twelve types of OD interventions. Of them, he lists "Diagnostic activities: Fact-finding activities designed to ascertain the state of the system, the status of a problem, and the way things are" (p. 18), as number one. This is exactly what the present study is designed to do, i.e., describe "the way things are" in University Services and Auxiliary Enterprises at the College of William and Mary.

There are many different types of organizational

change strategies. The one that Woodman and Muse (1982) mention that is especially applicable to this study is "job redesign." They define it as "...a deliberate planned restructuring of the way work is performed..." (p.39), and conclude that "As an organizational change strategy, job redesign represents a whole family of specific techniques, including...job enlargement..." (p. 39).

In Organization Development the employees themselves are trained to conduct surveys and analyze data. Sometimes an outside consultant is used in order to verify results or add credibility to the intraorganizational findings.

While Organization Development is a general change strategy that can apply to higher education institutions as well as business organizations, there are several national organizations that deal exclusively with higher education institutions. One of them is HEMI (Higher Education Management Institute). HEMI was created in 1976 with funds from the EXXON Foundation. According to Keist (1982), the HEMI data base contains the results of surveys completed by over 80,000 respondents and serves 200 colleges and universities. At the present time, HEMI is a part of

the American Council of Education's Center for Leadership Development and Academic Administration. The HEMI program, Keist (1982) states, is "...focused on the unique needs of each institution, as these are identified by the institution, using survey-guided needs assessment instruments" (p. 59). Survey instruments used by HEMI evolved from those created by Likert (1976). There are five phases in the HEMI program, viz., (1) program orientation phase, (2) needs assessment phase, (3) action planning and implementation phase, (4) training activities and developmental activities phase, and (5) evaluation phase. Each of these phases is essential if effective planned organizational change is to be achieved.

Baker (1982) discusses an organization called NISOD (National Institute for Staff and Organizational Development). It is designed to assist community colleges in their reorganization efforts. NISOD is composed of 29 community colleges. A consortium of community colleges and NISOD became partners-in-development through an award of more than one million dollars from the W. R. Kellogg foundation to the University of Texas, in December 1977. The name of the program at the University of Texas was CCLP (the

Community College Leadership Program). One of its objectives was to help community college faculty work on their doctorates.

Broomall (1976) in tracing the evolutionary change in community colleges, from their inception to modern times, indicates that before 1976 the enlargement of the role of community colleges occurred without adequate planning. It is alarming that such a large component of our higher education system developed in such a manner. Broomall's study was done in 1976, one year before the NISOD-community college colaboration. Hence, it can be seen from these statements that the need for planned change in community colleges has existed for a long time, and, today, even though we have organizations, such as NISOD, designed especially to help community colleges, the need for more planned change still exists.

After a college or university and its decision makers are committed to change, some method is needed to decide what needs changing. In most cases the method chosen is the survey-feedback method. This method, according to Watts (1982), is "One of the most widely used OD intervention methods" (p. 91). Watts (1982) gives the following three steps in the

survey-feedback method: (1) the information is gathered through surveys (usually using questionnaires and personal interviews), (2) the information is fed back to those that supplied it, and (3) a plan of action is developed to solve the problem. In the survey-feedback method everyone gets a copy of the final report, not just the top or mid-level managers.

Watts (1982) found that survey feedback was the only intervention designed to improve (1) the effectiveness of individual groups, (2) intergroup relations, and (3) the total organization. He concluded that "The potential for survey-feedback to have a positive, far-reaching effect on the organization is thus greater than for any of the other interventions" (p. 91). Not only has survey-feedback proven to be an effective OD intervention technique, but it can also be used as a change-status determination, or change-process evaluation, technique. Watts (1982) puts it this way:

> In addition, by establishing times for periodically readministering the survey, the organization can monitor the progress of the change and assess the change process itself. (p. 94)

Teitelbaum (1977) came to a similar conclusion.

Bower (1973; in Watts, 1982), in a study of 23 organizations, found that survey-feedback was the only method that improved organizational climate. Friedlander and Brown (1974; in Watts, 1982) conducted a thorough literature review of research on Organizational Development. They concluded that the efficacy of the survey-feedback intervention technique increases with increases in the number of participants involved.

Zaltman, Duncan, and Holbek (1973; in Fidler and Johnson, 1982) indicated five forms of organizational cange, viz., (1) change in a product or service, (2) change in a production process, (3) change in the structure of the organization, (4) change in the people in the organization, and (5) change in the policies of the orgənizatiion. Although the present study deals mainly with a change in organizational structure, the researcher is aware of the fact that "by-products" from such a change probably include changes in people and policies. There is probably a great deal of overlap in all of the forms of organizational change mentioned above.

Fidler and Johnson (1982) do a laudable job of

explaining what is meant by the "successful implenentation" of a change (viz., the routinization, incorporation, and stabilization of the change into the ongoing work activity), but they do not give any indication of how one might go about measuring this implementation. This is in spite of the fact that, as they state, "Advocating change...results in increased uncertainty..." (p. 4) and that decreasing uncertainty can decrease resistance to change. Later, in the same monograph, they describe two types of units that are involved in any type of organizational change, viz., the decision unit and the adoption unit. The decision unit is usually the upper unit. It decides whether or not an innovation or change is needed and what the change or innovation will be. The adoption unit, as the name suggests, is the unit that must adopt or implement the change. Fidler and Johnson (1982) also mention three reasons why an adoption unit might implement a change, viz., (1) because the change is a referent from the decision unit, (2) because the decision unit has a certain level of expertise about the change, and (3) because the decision unit has various options at its disposal to persuade the adopting unit to institute the change.

Ferguson (1981), in discussing the Organization Development program at Florida Junior College at Jacksonville, defines Oganization Development (OD) as a method for "...accomodating orderly change" (p. 3). He further states that OD "Reduces the disruptive nature of organizational change by providing a strategy for reacting to probable and possible future events and changes" (p. 3). The OD program at Florida Junior College was initiated in 1971. It is different from Management Development (MD), in that it seeks to involve more members of the organization at as many levels as is appropriate in making change decisions. Ferguson (1981) does not discuss any specific situation wherein OD was applies at Florida Junior College, but he does do a good job of explaining the purpose and structure of the OD program at the College.

Not all organizational writers feel that OD is desirable. March (1982), in discussing the "garbage can" decision making process, suggests that planned change is not always best. If an organization always relies on planned change, it may overlook a good serendipic solution to a problem. While March's (1982) point is well taken, on the other hand, colleges and universities cannot afford to simply sit back and rely

on serendipity. They must plan. They must try to anticipate changes that are likely to take place in the environment and must design strategies and procedures to deal with them. Only in this way can they eliminate much of the trauma mentioned by Langton (1977; in Hopkins and Sullivan, 1982), that many individuals experience during organizational change.

March (1977) discusses an organizational concept called "satisficing." He defines it as "the view that assumes an organization seeks to maximize the probability of an outcome that exceeds its aspiration level, rather than maximize expected reward..." (p. 8). A satisficing view toward organizational change might be desirable in some cases, but there is a high degree of uncertainty involved when it is used as a strategy for organizational change. Because its practioners strive to exceed their aspiration levels, there exists a great deal of uncertainty as to what those final levels will be.

Langton (1977; in Hopkins and Sullivan, 1982), in studying the reaction of faculty members at Georgia State University, concluded that the behavior of a faculty member experiencing reorganization is like a family member coping with death. To some members in an

organization, dealing with the uncertainty involved in organizational change is a traumatic experience.

Hopkins and Sullivan (1982) talk about the method used at Georgia State University to investigate organizational change, viz., the survey questionnaire method administered via personal interviews. The change that they studied involved trying to consolidate two colleges and another institution into one unit. They did a very good job of explaining how they study change at Georgia State University, but, here again, just as with the case of Ferguson (1981) and Florida Junior College, no mention was made about how one could go about measuring the success or completeness of that change.

Deshon (1977) found that "Survey/feedback is a very effective form of intervention as it tends to reduce differential perceptions as to what problems exist as well as their priorities of treatment" (p. 7). Other researchers have concluded similarly (Watts, 1982; Bower, 1973; in Woodman and Muse, 1982).

In the survey/feedback intervention technique, the researcher, or other individual, surveys individuals in a certain component of the organization, or the whole organization. The scope of the survey depends on

how much of the organization the intervention is intended to change. After surveying the appropriate departments (or components), the information is compiled and "fed" back to the appropriate component or, in some cases, the entire organization. If the purpose of the survey is just to bring about organizational change in a certain department or component of the organization, the detailed results are distributed at that level. Aggregate data (less specific) may be summarized at higher levels, or between departments. Surveys usually take the form of questionnaires which are administered through personal interviews.

Thelin (1976), in tracing the development of the "ivy leagues," found that changes in the academic rules to which athletes were subject ameliorated the bickering and strife between the competing institutions. Not all changes have been so well implemented as these were. Thelin did not discuss whether or not anyone's job was enlarged or redesigned as a result of these changes, but did a laudable job of tracing the evolution of the Big Eight ivy league football teams.

Harris (1977) studied the results of the

implementation of a PPB (Planning, Programming, Budgeting) system at Virginia Union University. She used as criteria for judging the adequacy of the change, the perceptions of the individuals (faculty and administrators) that were in some way involved with the new system. She found that there was quite a difference between how different constituents viewed the adequacy of the change.

Combs (1982) indicates that the current ambience provides managers with "...an opportunity to examine their organization's basic functions and their relationships with various constituents and to implement positive organizational change" (p. 9). Certainly, this statement is true even more so today, especially for managers of higher education institutions. Some type of organizational change is a "sine qua non" for most institutions of higher education in the present ambience of cutbacks and other budgetary constraints. The uncertainty lies in whether those changes will be positive or negative, and whether or not the relationships that develop as a result of such changes will be sufficient in number and strength to justify classifying the changes as successful or unsuccessful. Clearly, there is a need for a method of

determining to what degree an implemented change has been accomplished. Basing the completeness of a change upon the relationships or lack of relationships that it produces among various positions and components of the organization, and the negativeness or positiveness that it produces, is not an unreasonable approach to use to determine whether or not an implemented change is complete.

Baldwin (1976), in a study of the implementation of the Shared Cataloging System of the Ohio College Library Center (OCLC) at Syracuse, SUNY at Buffalo, and Cornell, concluded that the main problem that the institutions faced was "...the reorganization of work, jobs, and staff into an effective and economical operation..." (p. 12). He further stated that bringing the implemented system, at Buffalo, under control was "...achieved through a reorganization of functions into three new administrative units..." (p. 54). His study was designed, as he stated, to examine"...the problem of planned organizational change" (p. 5). It is similar to the present study in this respect, i.e., it dealt with planned organizational change. The present study is concerned with the relationships and perceptions that exist after an organizational change

is made, and not so much with the problem, or problems, involved in making the change.

The organizational cange in the three case studies discussed by Baldwin (1976) came about as a result of a technological innovation. Each of the institutions changed in a different way as a result of the implementation of this technological innovation. Baldwin (1976) discusses the reorganizations that took place at the three institutions as a sort of "fallout" or "by-product" of the implementation of the new cataloging system. He does not mention whether or not anyone made any attempt to monitor the relationships between the supervisors and various components of the libraries during the changes. He did mention that the three cases that he studied were considered successful implementations of the OCLC cataloging system, but did not elaborate on what he meant by "successful implementation."

Baldwin (1976) mentioned some of the changes in organizational structure that took place at the various institutions, as a result of implementing the OCLC system (e.g., at SUNY, clerical staff was moved from the cataloging team to form the Systems Cataloging Section, the supervisor of the old cataloging

maintenance team became the supervisor of the Systems Support Section), but he does not go into any detail analysis of them. At Cornell, two units of the library were combined and one, of two, supervisory position was eliminated. The job of the supervisor that remained expanded considerably. Essentially, his job was redesigned. Davis (1972; in Baldwin, 1976) indicates four models of job design, viz., (1) the minimum interaction model, (2) the welfare model, (3) the human interaction model, and (4) the behavioral model. The four models may also be used to explain job redesign.

Even though Baldwin (1976) did not do a complete analysis of the new relationships that developed as a result of the aforementioned technological implementation, his concern about them was expressed by the following statement about Syracuse's library:

> There is a good deal of uncertainty about the future of the library's own on-line system in relation to the developing OCLC services... (p. 63)

Finally, Baldwin lists six needs for job design, or job redesign, viz., independence, affiliation, achievement,

theory that is "merely thought up on the basis of 'a priori' assumptions and a touch of common sense, peppered with a few old theoretical speculations made by the erudite" (p. 137). According to them, a grounded theory promises to

> (1) reflect conditions actually present in particular change efforts (internal validity), (2) typify conditions actually present in other change efforts (external validity), (3) contribute to the generation of new concepts by constantly comparing information obtained by different methods (reflexivity), and (4) promote understanding among groups with conflicting frames of reference, including change agents, change sponsors, and change target (translatability). (Dunn and Swierczek, 1976, p. 138)

If, indeed, a grounded theory can do all of these things, its presence will be a step forward, not only for students or organizational change, but also students of general organizational theory as well.

responsibility, self-utilization, and self-development. Certainly these are good qualities for any job, from an employee's viewpoint, but, from a managerial standpoint, some of them may tend to erode organizational control.

Dunn and Swierczek (1976) used retrospective analysis to study 67 successful and unsuccessful change efforts. Their purpose was to determine whether or not logico-deductive theories of planned organizational change can be grounded by using statistical analysis (in this case, bivariate analysis using Cramer's V, Gamma, and Lambda). They defined planned organizational change as "...standardized and unstandardized strategies for purposefully altering the structure, behavior, technology, and climate of organizations" (Dunn and Swierczek, 1976, p. 136). Of five standardized strategies (Organization Development, Institution Building, Sociotechnical Design, Participative Management, and socioorganizational Design), They list OD as number one. They define grounded theory as theory which is "...generated directly from experience acquired in the course of social research..." (p. 137). Glaser (1967; in Dunn and Swierczek, 1976) defines logico-deductive theory as

Dunn and Swierczek (1976) identify three types of existing studies of planned organizational change, viz., universalistic, situational, and integrative. Universalistic studies deal with broad theoretical questions of organizational change. These are basically logico-deductive. Situational studies deal with information about what the best change strategy is for a specific type of situation. The last type of study, integrative, is the type that is most closely related to grounded theory. It "...attempts to match the state of general knowledge of planned organizational change with experiences of concrete change efforts" (p. 138).

The independent varialbes used by Dunn and Swierczek (1976) were (1) Type of Organization, (2) Societal Type, (3) Task Environment, (4) Change-Agent, (5) Mode of Intervention, (6) Change-Agent Orientation, (7) Origin of Change, (8) Focus of Change, (9) Focus of Solution, (10) Locus of Change, (11) Standardized Strategy (OD, Participative Management, Socioorganizational Design, Sociotechnical Design, Institution Building, and Others), and (12) Method (untried, proven, single, multiple). "Dependent variables were effectiveness of the change effort and

degree of adoption of the change" (Dunn and Swierczek, 1976, p. 141). They tested eleven logico-deductive theories. Of those eleven theories, only three of them were found to have empirical support, and that support was only low to moderate, based on the values for Cramer's V, Lambda, and Gamma

Aside from the lack of support for most of the organizational theories that they tested, Dunn and Swierczek (1976) found the following: (1) 100% of the organizational changes in commonwealth institutions were rated as effective, (2) only 57% of the organizational changes that were structural in nature were rated as effective, (3) 80% of the organizational changes that involved changes in departments were rated as effective, (4) 89% of the organizational changes that used the OD method of intervention were rated as effective, in contrast to 61% of those that used a nonstandardized method of intervention, (5) 90% of the non-indegenous/external changes were rated as effective, in contrast to only 63% of the indigenous/internal changes, (6) in cases where the change-agent orientation was participative, 83% were rated as effective, (7) changes which originated with a superordinate, but nonetheless, external source

(external to the component under study), within the same organization, include a very high proportion of effective cases (86%) whereas change efforts which originated internally (within the component under study) included a lesser proportion of effective cases. Dunn and Swierczek (1976) caution the reader that these findings are not generalizable to any population other than the 67 cases that they studied because of the lack of randomization in the design of their study. Much of the information contained in Dunn and Swierczek's (1976) study was taken from the Case Survey of Planned Organizational Change (CASPOC) data base.

The effectiveness, or none effectiveness, of the cases studied by Dunn and Swierczek (1976) was based solely on the perceptions of sponsors, external evaluators, or change-agents. There was no attempt at actually ascertaining objectively whether or not the changes really were effective (or complete). The present study differs from their study in that, instead of just taking someone's opinion on whether or not a change is complete (or effective), it seeks to establish this fact by using more objective criteria. In this respect, it is not really concerned with whether or not the components and individuals perceive

the change as complete, but whether or not it is, based on certain countable relationships and certain countable positive and/or negative responses to procedural, operational, and policy questions.

Moore and Sagaria (1982) studied the job change situation for line and staff administrators in colleges and universities in the State of Pennsylvania. They defined line administrators as those who usually move into their positions from faculty positions (e.g., vice presidents of academic affairs, provosts, deans of colleges or schools, etc.). Staff administrators, they say, are administrators that support the line administrators (e.g., assistant chief academic officer, assistant to the president, assistant to the chief business officer, etc.). Moore and Sagaria (1982) found that upward mobility was much greater for line administrators than for staff administrators. They also found that in many cases staff administrators were given more (or a larger area of) responsibility as a form of "promotion." This type of "promotion" is usually what organizational theorists refer to as job redesign. Hence, Sagaria and Moore (1982) analyzed job change situations with respect to upward mobility and job redesign, with little or no attempt at analyzing

the changes in organizational structure and organizational relationships that promotions and job redesign (through job enlargement) can create. The present study differs from their study in that it focuses on these structural and relational changes that result when a college administrator is promoted and/or his job is redesigned.

Gould (1964), in a study or leadership among college deans in liberal arts colleges, found that the deanship is changing considerably in function. During the period immediately following World War II, college presidents had to relinguish more of their duties to academic deans. Before then, the academic deanship was chiefly a student oriented position. Since World War II, the role and areas of responsibilty of the academic dean have expanded considerably. These changes in the role and responsibilities of the academic dean did not happen overnight. As Gould puts it: the older the college, the slower the rate of change. As history has recorded (Rudolph, 1963), so-called liberal arts colleges are among the oldest institutions in America. Thus, we can see the reason for the slow pace of change in the role and responsibilities of the academic dean in these types of colleges. Futhermore, if Gould´s

(1964) statement is indeed true, we would expect change at the College of William and Mary to be extremely slow, since it is one of the oldest colleges in America.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The method used in this study was the survey method. The survey was conducted by personal interviews. All interviews were conducted during the spring semester of the 1982-83 academic year. All interviews were conducted on the campus of The College of William and Mary in Virginia.

The sample for this study consisted of nine members of the administrative staff of the USAE component of the Business Affairs Office of the College of William and Mary, viz., the Director of the Univesity Bookstore, the Director of Buildings and Grounds, the Director of the Campus Center, the Director of Food Services, the Director of the Health Center, the Director of Psychological Services, the Director of Purchases and Stores, the Director of Student Residences, and the Director of the Athletic and Recreation Hall (William and Mary Hall). Scott (1978) and Moore and Sagaria (1982) refer to these individuals as "middle managers."

The instrument used in this study was a questionnaire (Appendix A). The questionnaire was

designed by the researcher in consultation with the Director of University Services and Auxiliary Enterprises and the Vice President of Business Affairs at the subject college. After the first two interviews, the questionnaire was refined and finalized.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

A list of relationships that the components of USAE have with its Director was compiled from the responses of the USAE component directors to questionnaire items 1 (How does your position relate to the position of Director of University Services and Auxiliary Enterprises?) and 2 (How does that relationship work as far as reporting, approvals, etc.?). Table 2 summarizes the relationships that the component directors were found to have with the Director of USAE.

Three respondents indicated that they consulted with the Director of USAE in exceptional and unusual situations. Five of the nine respondents indicated that their relationships with the Director of USAE included budgetary matters. Three components indicated that they consulted with the Director of USAE whenever there was a need for a plant or facility improvement. There was only one respondent in each of the following categories of relationships: (1) matters formerly handled by the Vice President for Business Affairs, (2) legal matter, and (3) matters involving

Table 2
Summary of Responses to Questions 1 and 2: Relationships of Components with the Position of Director of USAE

Type of Relationship	Components with Relationship
Consult with the Director in (or on):	
unusual situations	B WM P&S
budgetaty matters	B&G CC PS P&S SR
improvements in plant and facility	B&G FS SR
matters formerly handled by Business Affairs VP	B&G
contract matters	CC
legal matters	CC
state regulations	CC FS
monetary expenditures	FS B&G HS
setting rates and prices	FS SR
equipment purchases	FS
Related Due to Definition of USAE	WM B
Related because report to Director of USAE	B CC WM
Related because must get his approval on certain items	B CC FS

B=University Bookstore, WM=William and Mary Hall, P&S=Purchases and Stores Department, B&G=Building and Grounds, CC=Campus Center, PS=Psychological Services, SR=Student Residences, FS=Food Services, HS=Health Services.

equipment purchases. Two component directors indicated that they consulted with the Director of USAE in matters related to state regulations. Two components indicated a relationship in setting prices and rates. The University Bookstore and William and Mary Hall indicated that they were related to the Director of USAE by virtue of what the definition of "university services and auxiliary enterprises" is. Hence, they indicated a definitional relationship. The reporting and approval relationships were listed by three components each. The University Bookstore, the Campus Center, and the William and Mary Hall indicated a reporting relationship. The approval relationship was indicated by the University Bookstore, the Campus Center, and Food Services.

Table 3 shows a breakdown of the number of relationships that each category of components (direct, quasi-, old, and new) was perceived as having with the Director of USAE. The numbers in the table show that the old components were perceived as having a larger percentage of relationships with the Director of USAE (92%) than the new components (only 38%). Eighty-five percent of the relationships were possessed by the direct components whereas only 69% were possessed by

Table 3
Analysis of Responses to Questions 1 and 2: Percent of Identified Relationships for Each Category of Component

Category	Count	Percent of Relationships
Direct Components	11	85%
Quasi-Components	9	69%
Old Components	12	92%
New Components	5	38%

the quasi-components. These data suggest that perhaps the new components have not been completely assimilated into the organizational process, since the old, quasi-, and direct components have considerably more relationships than they do.

Table 4 was compiled from responses given by the directors of the components of USAE to question 3 (How do you visualize your operation as fitting into the overall operation of University Services and Auxiliary Enterprises?). The information in the table indicates that the majority of USAE component directors (67%) visualized their operation as fitting into USAE by virtue of the fact that they offer some student related services. The second highest number of components (44%) saw themselves as fitting into USAE because they provide some academic support services. Only 22% of the components said that they are a part of USAE because of their profit orientation. One of the components said that it fits into USAE because it acts as a clearinghouse for complaints and concerns. These data suggest that University Services and Auxiliary Enterprises, at the College of William and Mary, is chiefly a student-oriented activity.

Table 5 shows the results of the responses to

Table 4
Analysis of Responses to Question 3: How do you visualize your operation as fitting into the overall operation of University Services and Auxiliary Enterprises?

Perceived way of Fitting In	Components	Count	Percent of Components
Academic Support Service	B P&S wm B&G	4	44%
Administrative Support Service	B&G P&S	2	22%
Student Support Service	CC PS SR WM HS B&G	6	67%
General Auxiliary Service	B&G FS	2	22%
Profit Function	B FS	2	22%
Clearinghouse for Complaints/Concerns	B&G	1	11%
Interface with Community/Parents	B&G WM	2	22%
Vehicle for Departmental Interaction	B&G	1	11%

B=University Bookstore, WM=William and Mary Hall, P&S=Purchases and Stores Department, B&G=Building and Grounds, CC=Campus Center, PS=Psychological Services, SR=Student Residences, FS=Food Services, HS=Health Services.

question 4 (Do you feel that your operation is adequately staffed, understaffed, or overstaffed?) for various categories of components of USAE. As indicated in the table, none of the directors felt that their operations were overstaffed. Sixty percent of the direct components compared to only 25% of the quasi-components felt that their operations were understaffed. Only 28% of the directors of the old components compared to 100% of the new components felt that their operations were understaffed. In the aggregate, 45% of the components were rated as understaffed and 55% were rated as adequately staffed. These data suggest that direct components and new components are more severly understaffed than are quasi-components and old components. This further suggests that the latter two of these four types of components have been most hard hit by recent budget cuts.

Table 6 shows the breakdown of the responses to question 5 (Do you feel that your operation is getting adequate support from the College's budget?) into the categories of "direct," "quasi-," "old," and "new" components of USAE. Sixty percent of the direct components in contrast to only 25% of the

Table 5
Analysis of Responses to Question 4
Do you feel that your operation is adequately staffed, understaffed, or overstaffed?

Type of Component	Response Category: understaffed n	%	adequately staffed n	%	overstaffed n	%
Direct	3	60%	2	40%	0	0%
Quasi	1	25%	3	75%	0	0%
Old	2	28%	5	71%	0	0%
New	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	4	45%	5	55%	0	0%

Table 6

Analysis of Responses to Question 5
Do you feel that your operation is getting adequate support from the College's Budget?

Type of Component	Response Category: YES n	YES %	NO n	NO %
Direct	2	40%	3	60%
Quasi	3	75%	1	25%
Old	5	71%	2	29%
New	0	0%	2	100%
Total	5	55%	4	45%

quasi-components indicated that they did not feel that they were getting adequate support from the College's budget. Overall, 55% of the Seventy-one percent of the old components compared to 0% of the new components felt that they were getting adequate support from the College's budget. Overall, 55% of the component directors indicated that they were getting adequate support from the College's budget. Forty-five percent said that they were not. These data suggest that direct components get
considerably more support from the College's budget than quasi-components and that old components get extremely more support from the College's budget than new one get.

Table 7 shows the breakdown of the responses to question 6 (Is funding of the quality of services for which you are responsible at a sufficiently high level?) into the various categories of USAE components. As indicated in the table, 67% of the directors of direct components compared to only 33% of the directors of quasi-components indicated that funding of the quality of service for which they are responsible is at a sufficiently high level. This is a difference of 34%. A comparison of the old and new components, reveals

Table 7

Analysis of Responses to Question 6
Is funding of the quality of services for which you are responsible at a sufficiently high level?

Type of Component	Response Category			
	YES		NO	
	n	%	n	%
Direct	3	60%	2	40%
Quasi	2	50%	2	50%
Old	4	57%	3	43%
New	1	50%	1	50%
Total	5	55%	4	45%

that 57% of the old components compared to 50% of the new components felt that funding of the quality of their services was at a sufficiently high level. Overall, 55% of the component directors indicated funding at a sufficiently high level of quality. Forty-five percent indicated otherwise. These data suggest that while there is a considerably large difference betwen how direct and quasi-components perceive the funding of their quality, the perceptions of old and new components of the funding of their quality is about the same.

Table 8 shows the breakdown of responses to question 7 (Do you feel that a Director of USAE position is essential to the smooth running of the operation for which you are responsible?) into the various categories of components of USAE. Forty percent of the direct components in contrast to only 100% of the quasi-components indicated that they felt that a Director of USAE is essential for the smooth running of their operations. A comparison of the old and new components on this questionnaire item reveals that 71% of the old components compared to only 50% of the new components felt that a Director of USAE position was essential for the smooth running of their

Table 8

Analysis of Responses to Question 7:
Do you feel that a Director of University Services and Auxiliary Enterprises is essential to the smooth running of the operation for which you are responsible?

Type of Component	Response Category: YES n	YES %	NO n	NO %
Direct	2	40%	3	60%
Quasi	4	100%	0	0%
Old	5	71%	2	29%
New	1	50%	1	50%
Total	6	67%	3	33%

operations. Overall, 67% of the component directors indicated that they felt that a Director of USAE is essential for the smooth running of their operations. Forty-five percent felt otherwise. These data suggest that the position of Director of USAE is more crucial to the smooth running of quasi- and old components than to direct and new components.

Table 9 shows the breakdown of the responses to question 8 (Do you feel that you are getting the kind of support that you should be getting in terms of administration, e.g., are purchasing methods cumbersome, are there long delays in responding to your requests?) divided into the four categories of USAE components. Sixty percent of the direct components in contrast to only 25% of the quasi-components indicated that they felt that their operations were getting the kind of support they needed in terms of administration. A comparison of the old and new components reveals that 43% of the old components compared to 50% of the new components felt that they were getting the kind of support that they needed in terms of administration. Overall, 45% of the component directors indicated that they were getting the kind of administrative support that they needed. Fifty-five percent felt otherwise.

Table 9

Analysis of Responses to Question 8:

Do you feel that you are getting the kind of support that you should in terms of administration, e.g., are purchasing methods cumbersome, are there long delays in responding to your requests?

Type of Component	Response Category: YES		NO	
	n	%	n	%
Direct	3	60%	2	40%
Quasi	1	25%	3	75%
Old	3	43%	4	57%
New	1	50%	1	50%
Total	4	45%	5	55%

These data suggest that direct components are getting better administrative support than quasi-components. They further suggest that new components might be getting only slightly better administrative support than old components.

Table 10 shows the breakdown of the responses to question 9 (Do you feel that you have adequate input in the decision making process, when those decisions affect you, your area of responsibility, or the personnel that you supervise?) into the categories ("direct," "quasi-," "old," and "new") of components of USAE. Fifty percent of the direct components in contrast to only 100% of the quasi-components indicated that they felt that they have adequate input into the decision making process. A comparison of the old and new components reveals that 86% of the old components compared to 100% of the new components felt that they have adequate input in the decision making process. Overall, 67% of the component directors indicated that they have adequate input in the decision making process. Thirty-three percent said that they do not. These data suggest that quasi-components and new components have more decision making power than direct components and old components have, respectively.

Table 10

Analysis of Responses to Question 9:
Do you feel that you have adequate input in the decision making process, when those decisions affect you, your area of responsibility, or the personnel that you supervise?

Type of Component	Response Category			
	YES		NO	
	n	%	n	%
Direct	2	40%	3	60%
Quasi	4	100%	0	0%
Old	6	86%	1	14%
New	0	0%	2	100%
Total	6	67%	3	33%

Table 11 shows a summary of the responses to questions 10 (What aspects of the present system do you feel are most in need of improvement or change?). Fifty-five percent of the component directors felt that there was a need for some type of improvement or change in their physical plants and/or facilities. 25% of the directors indicated a need for improvement in communications. Thirty-three percent of the respondents indicated a need for new or improved furniture and/or equipment (including computers). Budgetary and/or financial changes were sighted by only 22% of the directors. Changes in organizational structure, procedural changes, and changes in the method of payment of bills was cited by 11%, 22%, and 11% of the respondents, respectively. These data suggest that the area of University Services and Auxiliary Enterprises most in need of improvement or change is physical plant/facilities.

Table 12 was compiled from the responses of the old and new components of USAE to questions 1 and 2. There were a total of 13 relationships identified. Of these 13 relationships, the old components indicated that they possessed 12 of them whereas the new components indicated only 5. In other words, the old

Table 11

Summary of Responses to Questions 10:

What aspects of the present system do you feel are most in need of improvement or change?

Aspects in Need of Change or Improvements	Count	Percent of Components Indicating Each Aspect
Budgetary or Finanacial	2	22%
Equipment or Furniture	3	33%
Facilities	5	55%
Organizational Structure	1	11%
Communications	2	22%
Procedural	2	22%
Method of Paying Bills	1	11%

Table 12

Analysis of Relationships

Components	Number of Relationships
Old	
University Bookstore (D)	4
Food Services (D)	6
R & E Hall (D)	3
Campus Center (Q)	6
Health Services (Q)	1
Psychological Services (Q)	1
Student Residences (Q)	3
New	
Buildings and Grounds (D)	4
Purchases and Stores (D)	2

The average number of relationships for old components equals 3.43, whereas the average number of relationships that the new components have with the Director of USAE is 3.00.

components indicated that they possessed 92.3% of the relationships. The new components, on the other hand, indicated that they possessed only 38.5%. The average number of relationships for old components was 3.43, whereas for new components it was 3.00. These data suggest that old components have more relationships with the Director of USAE than new components.

Table 13 was compiled from the responses of the old and new component directors of USAE to questions 4 through 9, inclusive. For the old components, there were a total of 42 responses, of which 28 (or 67%) were positive. This is in contrast to the new components, which had a positive response rate of only 25%. The average number of positive responses for the old components was 3.86 compared to only 1.5 for the new components. The average number of negative responses for the old components was 2 compared to 4.5 for the new components. These data suggest that the old components had a more positive attitude about USAE than did the new components.

Testing of Hypotheses

one way to determining whether or not the USAE organizational change is complete is to assume, first of all, that when the change is complete, the old and

Table 13

Positive and Negative Responses to Questions 4 thru 9

Components	No. of Neg. Responses	No. of Pos. Responses
Old		
University Bookstore (D)	4	2
Food Services (D)	5	1
R & E Hall (D)	2	4
Campus Center (Q)	5	1
Health Services (Q)	4	1
Psychological Services (Q)	2	4
Student Residences (Q)	5	1
New		
Buildings and Grounds (D)	1	5
Purchases and Stores (D)	2	4

The average number of positive responses for the old components equals 3.86, whereas the average number of positive responses for the new components is 1.5. The average number of negative responses for the old components is 2, whereas the average number of negative responses for the new components is 4.5.

new components will have the same average number of relationships with the Director of USAE. In this case, we would need to test the following hypothesis:

> Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference between the average number of relationships that new and old components have with the Director of USAE.

If this hypothesis is accepted, we would conclude that the change is complete.

This hypothesis was tested using a t-test. The analysis was performed using the SPSSX statistical package run on a mainframe Prime computer. The pooled variance t-value was .27. The difference betweem the means of the two groups was significant only at the .796 level. Hence, based on this test we accept Hypothesis 1 and conclude that the change is complete. These data suggest that perhaps the so-called "reorganization" of the Business Affairs Office at the subject college was just a formalization of the relationships that had developed between the position of Director of USAE and its components over the years. This is suggested by the fact that the change is much

further along than one would expect based on what some researchers say about the slowness of change in older colleges and universities.

Another way of determining whether or not the change is complete is to assume that, when the change is complete, the old and new components will have the same average number of positive responses or negative responses to questions 4 throuh 9 on the questionnaire. In this case we would have to test the following two hypotheses:

> Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference between the average number of positive responses that new and old components made to items 4 through 9 on the questionnaire.
>
> Hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference between the average number of negative responses that new and old components made to items 4 through 9 on the questionnaire.

The acceptance of either of these two hypotheses

would support the conclusion that the change is complete. Both hypotheses were tested using a t-test. The analysis was performed using the SPSSX statistical package run on a mainframe Prime computer. The pooled variance t-value for Hypothesis 2 was 2.31. The difference betweem the means of the two groups was significant only at the .054 level. Hence, based on this test we accept Hypothesis 2, at the .o5 level of significance, and conclude that the change is complete. The pooled variance t-value for Hypothesis 3 was -2.33. The difference betweem the means of the two groups was significant only at the .052 level. Hence, at the .05 level, we accept Hypothesis 3 and conclude that the change is complete. Here again, because of the slowness of change mentioned in the higher education literature (Rudolph, 1963; Gould, 1964), and the short length of time that the formal change, at the subject college, had been in effect at the time of this study (two months), these data suggest that many of the relationships that the new components have with the Director of USAE were probably already present when the formal reorganization took place. This further suggests that perhaps one of the reasons for the formal reorganization was to bring the formal organizational

structure more in line with the the way the organization really functions.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The findings of this study indicate that the change in the USAE segment of the Business Affairs Office at the subject college has reached completion. This state of completion is probably due, in part, to the fact that many of the relationships the the Director of USAE have with its components probably existed, informally, before the formal reorganization took place. This is because of what some researchers (Rudolph, 1963; Gould, 1964) said about the slowness of change in older colleges and universities. This "natural" slowness theory suggests that, if the many of the relationships had not already been in effect at the time of the formal reorganization, the change would be much less complete than it is now. If the change is progressing in the right direction, a later study should reveal smaller differences between the number of relationships and the types of responses that the old and new components indicate on the survey instrument.

In light of the above findings and what OD writers (e.g., Hammons, 1982; Watts, 1982) say about the need need for periodic reexaminations of implemented changes, it is recommended that this study, or a similar one, be conducted at a later date (perhaps 6 to 12 months later) at the subject institution, in order to make sure that the change continues to progress in the right direction and that the goals of the change is being accomplished. Furthermore it is recommended that a checklist of relationships that new components should have with the Director of USAE be compiled. Such a checklist can facilitate the data collection process during the aforementioned reexaminations. A thorough analysis of the relationships that exist between the Director of USAE and all the components of the subject college should be undertaken. Studies similar to this one study should be conducted at other colleges and univeresities and their results should be compared with those of this study, in order to determine if there are some relationships, between USAE Directors and their components, that are the same in all colleges and universities.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Baker, George A. (1982). The national institute: a partnership for development. In James O. Hammons, (Ed.), Organization Development: Change Strategies (New Directions for Community Colleges) (pp. 69-90). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Baldwin, Paul E. (1976). Bibliographic control problems and organizational change issues posed by the implenentation of a computer based cooperative cataloging support system. (Masters Thesis). Burnaby, B. C.: Simon Fraser University. (ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED 211 121).

Broomall, Lawrence W. (1976). A study of revenues and expenditures in community coleges grouped by size, control, and curricular balance. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Virgina Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburgh, VA.

Boyer, Roy (1981). Decisions, changes, and continuity. Educational Records, 62, 44-48.

Combs, Charles D. (1982). Beyond cutback management: alternative responses to resource scarcity. Philadelphia, PA: Urban Affairs Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED 217 530).

Davis, Louis E. (1972). Design of jobs: selected

readings. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books.

Deshon, David S. (1977). The w. k. kellogg foundation program at the university of akron: if we had to do it over--hindsight and foresight. Chicago, IL: American Institute for Decision Science. (ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED 213 366).

Dunn, William D. & Swierczek, Frederic W. (1977). Planned organizational change: toward grounded theory. The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science. 13, 135-157.

Ferguson, Charles O. (1981). Institutional management through organizational development (OD). Oxford, England: Transatlantic Institute. (ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED 216 733).

Fidler, Lori A. & Johnson, J. David (1982). Characteristics of innovations and organizational structure related to innovation implementation. Boston, MA: International Communication Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED 218 682).

Hammons, James (1982). Organization development: an overview. In James Hammons (Ed.), Organization Development: Change Strategies (New Directions for Community Colleges) (pp. 5-21). San

Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Harris, R. C. (1977). A method of evaluating a planning, programming, budgeting system (ppbs): a case study of virginia union university. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia.

Hopkins, Charles E. & Sullivan Margaret M. (1982). Organizational change: implications for institutional research. Charlotte, NC: Southern Association for Institutional Research. (ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED 210 997).

Hunter, S. N. (1981). Reorganising Institutional structures and processes for excellence. Journal of Tertiary Educational Administration. 3, 169-74.

Kest, David L. (1982). The higher education management institute (hemi): organization development through increased management effectiveness. In James O. Hammons (Ed.), Oganization Development: Change Strategies (New Directions for Community Colleges) (pp. 55-68). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

March, James G. (1981). Organization and control. Administrative Science Quarterly. 6, 545-62

March, James G. (1982). Emerging developments in the study of organizations. Washington, D.C.:

Association for the Study of Higher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED 219 045).

Moore, K. M. & Sagaria, M. A. (1982). Differential job change and stability among academic administrators. Journal of Higher Education. 53, 501-13.

Nadler, D. A. (1982). Managing transition to uncertain future states. Organization Dynamics. 11, 37-45.

Rudolph, Frederic (1963). The American College and University. New York: Vintage Books.

Scott, R. A. (1978). Lords, squires, and yeomen: collegiate middle managers and their organizations. ----------: AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Report No. 7.

Teitelbaum, Robert D. (1977). An approach to the measurement of unit costs in higher education fund-raising. Unpublished doctoral dissertation: College of William and Mary: Williamsbur , VA.

Thelin, John R. (1963). The cultivation of ivy: a saga of college in america. Cambridge, Massechusetts: Schenkman Publishing.

Varney, Glenn H. (1982). Organization development: unanswered questions. In James

Hammons (Ed.), Organization Development:
Change Strategies(New Directions for Community
Colleges) (pp. 45-54). San Francisco, CA:
Jossey-Bass.

Watts, Gordon E. (1982). Survey feedback: an effective
od intervention. In James O. Hammons, (Ed.),
Organization Development: Change Strategies (New
Directions for Community Colleges) (pp. 91-106).
San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Woodman, R. W. & Muse, W. V. (1982). Organization
development in the profit sector: lessons learned.
Organization Development: Change Strategies (New
Directions for Community Colleges) (pp. 23-44).
San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.